

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-32 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 8, 15, 23, and 31 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1-6, 9-13, 16-22, 24-30, and 32 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-22, 24-30, and 32 remain pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Objection To Drawings

In item 3 on page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to the drawings of the present application, alleging that Figures 1-8 should be designated as "PRIOR ART".

By this Amendment, Replacement Sheets have been submitted for Figures 1-8, identifying the drawings as "PRIOR ART". Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Examiner's objections to the drawings.

Objection To the Specification

In item 4 on page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to the title of the application, alleging that the title is not descriptive.

By this Amendment, the title has been amended. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Examiner's objection to the title.

In item 6 on page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to the disclosure, alleging informalities with the phrase "face each other".

By this Amendment, the specification has been amended and no longer includes the language objected to by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Examiner's objection to the specification.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112

In item 7 on pages 3-4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, alleging that the claim fails to comply with the written description requirement.

By this Amendment, claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In items 8-19 on pages 4-7 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner cited various examples as being allegedly indefinite.

By this Amendment, claims 8, 15, 23, and 31 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Additionally, claims 1-6, 9-13, 16-22, 24-30, and 32 have been amended and no longer include the language in the form rejected by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's §112, second paragraph rejections of the pending claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In items 20-33 on pages 7-11 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 13, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art(hereinafter referred to as "AAPA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,947,415, issued to Nagaraj (hereinafter referred to as "Nagaraj"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites a console switch having an examining unit that examines whether transmission and reception data generated between the terminal and the hardware port of the information processing device are to be accumulated as logs, and a memory unit that stores the transmission and reception data when the transmission and reception data are to be accumulated as logs. The recited memory unit was formerly recited in claim 8, which has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The examining unit is described in the current application at least in page 28, lines 10-15, page 29, lines 3-15, and illustrated in Figure 27. The Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references disclose or suggest at least these features of claim 1.

The Examiner acknowledged, in item 63 on page 18 of the Office Action, that neither AAPA nor Nagaraj disclose the memory unit recited in claim 1. Further, neither of these references discloses the recited examining unit of claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over those references.

The Examiner went on to allege that North discloses a memory subsystem capable of storing logs of all accesses and actions performed on the computing devices in the allocated

space 124, and that it would have been obvious to combine the disclosure of North with AAPA and Nagaraj. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that assuming, arguendo, that the memory subsystem cited by the Examiner may store logs of all accesses and actions performed on the computing devices, North nevertheless fails to disclose or suggest examining whether transmission and reception data generated between the terminal and the hardware port of the information processing device are to be accumulated as logs, and storing the transmission and reception data when the transmission and reception data are to be accumulated as logs, such as performed by the recited examining unit and memory unit of claim 1 of the present application. Thus, in one example embodiment enabled by the features of claim 1, and which is not possible with the Examiner's cited references, when the transmission and reception data are to be accumulated as logs, the transmission and reception data is stored into the memory unit, and therefore the memory capacity of the memory unit can be relatively smaller.

In order to form a proper §103 rejection, the cited references must disclose all of the features of the rejected claim. Therefore, since none of the cited references, taken either alone or together, disclose, suggest, nor even contemplate at least the features of claim 1 discussed above, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Independent claims 13, 16-17, and 25, as amended, recite similar features to those discussed above in regard to claim 1, and which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 13, 17, and 25 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1, claims 18 and 21 depend from claim 17, and claims 26 and 29 depend from claim 25. These dependent claims include all of the features of their respective independent claims, plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5, 18, 21, 26, and 29 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In items 34-58 on pages 11-17 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22, 24, 27, 28, 30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and Nagaraj in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,917,626, issued to Duvvury (hereinafter referred to as "Duvvury"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

As previously discussed in this Amendment, claims 1, 13, 16-17, and 25 patentably distinguish over AAPA and Nagaraj. Further, as Duvvury apparently merely discloses learning a

MAC address and storing it in a memory, Duvvury does not cure the deficiencies of AAPA and Nagaraj regarding claims 1, 13, 16-17, and 25 of the present application. Therefore, as claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22, 24, 27, 28, 30, and 32 depend respectively from one of these independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In items 59-70 on pages 17-20 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 7-11, 23, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and Nagaraj in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,505,245, issued to North et al. (hereinafter referred to as "North"). By this Amendment, claims 8, 23, and 31 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of the remaining claims.

As previously discussed in this Amendment, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over AAPA Nagaraj, and North. Therefore, as claims 7 and 9-11 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 9-11 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In items 71-77 on pages 20-22 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and Nagaraj in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/002492, issued to Gallagher et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Gallagher"). By this Amendment, claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the remaining claim.

As previously discussed in this Amendment, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over AAPA and Nagaraj. Further, as Gallagher apparently merely discloses a switch capable of providing connections between attached devices, Gallagher does not cure the deficiencies of AAPA and Nagaraj regarding claim 1 of the present application. Therefore, as claim 2 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 also patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and drawings have been amended, claims 8, 15, 23, and 31 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1-6, 9-

Serial No. 10/763,162

13, 16-22, 24-30, and 32 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-22, 24-30, and 31 remain pending in the application.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 12, 2007

By: Thomas L. Jones
Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501